

238. Also, petition of Carter Euziere, grain dealer, Manteno, Ill., opposing any farm-relief measure discriminating against private capital; to the Committee on Agriculture.

239. Also, petition of the Florsheim Shoe Co., Chicago, Ill., urging the placement of hides on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

240. Also, petition of P. L. Betts, Chicago Equity-Union Exchange, urging increase of tariff on oils and fats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

241. Also, petition of George M. Van Kirk and associates urging passage of House bill 12693 and Senate bill 3894; to the Committee on Agriculture.

242. Also, petition of John E. Wilder, of Wilder & Co., 1038 Crosley Street, Chicago, Ill., urging the placement of hides on free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

243. Also, petition of Irvin Funk, of M. Funk & Son, grain merchants, Kernan, Ill.; Oscar Berga, Amboy, Ill.; and J. H. Rosentiel, president Rosentiel & Co., Freeport, Ill., opposing any farm-relief measure discriminating against private capital; to the Committee on Agriculture.

244. Also, petition of H. E. Crum, Cornell, Ill., protesting against any farm relief measure discriminating against private cooperative companies; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

FRIDAY, April 26, 1929

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 23, 1929)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hattigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 179) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to dispose of the marine biological station at Key West, Fla.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1) to establish a Federal farm board to promote the effective merchandising of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce and to place agriculture on a basis of economic equality with other industries, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 179. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to dispose of the marine biological station at Key West, Fla.; and

H. R. 1412. An act making appropriations for certain expenses of the legislative branch incident to the first session of the Seventy-first Congress.

BOARD OF REGENTS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The VICE PRESIDENT. In accordance with the provisions of section 5581 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C. p. 613, sec. 43), the Chair appoints the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution for the term ending March 3, 1935, to succeed himself, his term as regent having expired on March 3 last.

INTERFERENCE WITH SENATOR HEFLIN'S RIGHTS

Mr. HEFLIN addressed the Chair.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Edge	Kean	Sheppard
Ashurst	Fess	Kendrick	Shortridge
Barkley	Fletcher	Keyes	Simmons
Bingham	Frazier	King	Smith
Black	George	La Follette	Smoot
Blaine	Glass	McKellar	Steak
Bleuse	Goff	McMaster	Steiwer
Borah	Goldsborough	McNary	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	Gould	Metcalf	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Greene	Norbeck	Trammell
Broussard	Hale	Norris	Tydings
Burton	Harris	Nye	Tyson
Capper	Harrison	Oddie	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hastings	Overman	Wagner
Connally	Hawes	Patterson	Walcott
Copeland	Hayden	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Hebert	Pine	Walsh, Mont.
Cutting	Hefflin	Pittman	Warren
Dale	Howell	Robinson, Ark.	Waterman
Deneen	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.	Watson
Dill	Jones	Sackett	Wheeler

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. WATSON and Mr. HEFLIN addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WATSON. In accordance with the promise—

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Washington Post this morning contains a misleading statement and a false statement about the action of Alabama women regarding me and the un-American activities of the Roman Catholic political machine. Mr. George Rothwell Brown, one of the faithful of the Vatican, said that Senator HEFLIN had been denounced by 30,000 women in Alabama. His statement in addition to being ridiculous is absolutely untrue.

Mr. President, I had a telegram from some friends in Birmingham this morning, stating that there are not a hundred women members of the organization named, and I now challenge them to show 500 members in a population of two and one-half million people in Alabama. This is a clumsy and contemptible piece of cheap politics. This remarkable outburst that bears the name of a woman at Birmingham was gotten up by my enemies, both inside and outside the State. A right interesting feature in connection with it is, Mr. President, that it comes from New York, "New York World News Service," the article shows that, with the date line of Birmingham, Ala. I knew that some of that Roman bunch up there had a hand in this thing. It has come right out of the hotbed of the Raskobs and Tammanyites, where Governor Smith introduced an amendment in the constitutional convention in New York to put the parochial schools on the same level with the public schools of America, where he undertook to amend the constitution by providing that in the State of New York the public funds should be appropriated to parochial schools the same as to public schools.

So this will enable the people of the country to get a new light on the question that I am discussing here—the dangers which threaten the American Government, and because of that a conspiracy has been formed against me. Probably somebody in Washington had a hand in this bogus Roman statement from Birmingham by way of New York. The New York Romanists figured in it. They, with a small bunch of ambitious and unscrupulous men used a woman's name down in Alabama, the same woman who last fall, according to reports to me by Democrats who supported Mr. Hoover, came to the Hoover headquarters and told them that she would support Hoover if she could get some money, and that she would try to swing the women there into line for Hoover if the money should be forthcoming.

That gives you briefly the sneaking, disgusting, and reprehensible move that has been made against me by my enemies and the hirelings of Rome in the nighttime just a few hours before a vote was to be taken in the Senate upon a resolution which involved a matter where a Senator in this body (myself) had been assaulted with the intent to murder him, and where the Senate was called upon to rebuke the people who interfered with the right of free speech, one of the great bulwarks of American liberty, and the right of peaceful assembly, another of the mighty bulwarks of the rights and interests of the masses of America. They constitute a city of refuge for mistreated and oppressed labor. They are the strongholds of liberty to patriots everywhere. I repeat, on top of the two offenses just mentioned violence was employed to attack a United States Senator and to murder him if possible. A policeman in Brockton bears the marks of a terrible scar on his temple where this would-be assassin struck him down and almost murdered him. I was asking the Senate simply to declare that we favor the protection of the citizen in his right of free speech and peaceful assembly and to express its disapproval and condemnation of an assault made upon a Senator for exercising his constitutional right of free speech. And, Mr. President, when the Senate was about to take action on the matter this crooked and miserable article comes out of my home State, they claim, and appears in a paper in the Capital City this morning when they had been told a vote would be had without debate, and when the Senate was being solemnly called upon to express itself upon a question vital to the rights and liberties of every American citizen.

This thing was undertaken once before in Alabama in a little different way. When I was leading the fight in the Senate to drive Governor Harding from the Federal Reserve Board for aiding in producing a panic that robbed the farmers, merchants, bankers, and manufacturers in Alabama of millions of dollars a State Democratic convention was held, and a certain chairman was to get through that convention a resolution indorsing Governor Harding. But my friends were on guard and prevented it. Senators, a grave and serious ques-

tion confronts you and the country. This is one of the test stations in your political career. Here is where your true American measure is going to be taken. Here is where the people of your State are going to see how you vote when Rome demands the defeat of my resolution. It is a question as to whether or not an American citizen and Senator is going to be permitted to speak about issues in our own country without asking permission of Roman Catholics or anybody else, which he thinks are vital to the welfare of his country and give warning against dangers which he thinks threaten free government in America. Are you going to take the position that a United States Senator may not do that in America now because there is a group of people here in the United States who have determined to suppress free speech on Roman activities in the United States not only outside of but inside of the Senate Chamber? Do you want to take the stand that surrenders your own and your people's rights and liberties in order to court favor and gain political support from the Roman group? No intelligent, honest American can fail to see that the priests and other political leaders of Rome are moving determinedly against the bulwarks of liberty in the western world.

You know that there is no excuse from that conclusion. I have brought to your attention instances time and time again of the dangerous doings of Roman Catholic leaders in the United States, and no one has challenged the correctness of my statements—not even the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] or the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. None has challenged them. They stand in the Record unchallenged. I challenge these two Senators now to point out any of those instances where I have told about dangerous Roman Catholic activities in the United States that are not correct, and I pause for a reply from either one of them or from any other Senator.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senator from Alabama is not addressing himself to a question of personal privilege. So long as the Senator discussed the article that was printed in the newspapers this morning, I was willing to concede that it was a matter of personal privilege about which he had a right to address the Senate. Now, however, he has gotten back to the old speech that he has made time and time without number. He is not discussing a question of privilege, but is simply discussing the resolution that is pending in this body upon which, if given an opportunity, I want to ask that a vote be taken.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I yielded in the hope that the Senator would answer my challenge, but no; he rises for the purpose of stopping me. He wants me to quit. I am discussing a resolution supposed to be passed at Birmingham by probably a half dozen people claiming fraudulently to come from 30,000 women of my State. I deny that 30,000 white women in my State, or 300, have passed any such resolution as appeared here this morning in this Roman Catholic paper. I am now discussing precisely the question raised in the New York-Birmingham resolution, and it is a matter of privilege, of course. I want you Senators to hear what I have to say on this question. The American people are waking up and this is not the only time that you are going to hear of this subject. It will be before the American people until it is settled in the American way.

Now, let me make a proposition: I will be willing to stop discussing it if these un-American Roman activities shall cease. If you will get them to strike out of the Roman Catholic school textbooks the doctrine of union of church and state now being taught in Catholic schools in the United States; if you will get them to declare that their first duty is to the Government of the United States and not to the Pope and Catholic king of the Vatican in Italy; if you will get them to say that they accept and respect the Protestant and Jewish marriage ceremony on the same basis as the Roman Catholic marriage ceremony; and if you will get them to say that their first allegiance is to the Constitution and flag of the United States and not to the Pope, I will be happy to cease the discussion of this now very vital and dangerous question.

Now, I want you as American Senators to be fair with me. If they will not come out in the open and publicly take the American stand as I have stated it, but continue their un-American activities that I have mentioned, would you have me quit the fight and surrender? Senators, this question can not be waved aside. I have a list in my hand of every Senator, Democrat and Republican, who is running for reelection next

year. I am going to print the names in the Record, and I appeal especially to Senators who are going to the people real soon, because they are going to be asked about this question. Somebody may ask you why you hesitated to vote for HEFLIN's resolution when Roman Catholic influence was fighting it to the bitter end. How did you vote when free speech, peaceful assembly, and a Senator's right to exercise his right of free speech when Catholics did not want him to speak? These will be some of the questions that you will be asked.

Mr. President, this mysterious resolution from New York and Birmingham states that—

We repudiate Senator HEFLIN as our representative in any sense.

Well, feeling that I know who wrote and set this miserable thing in motion, I thank them for that compliment. I do not represent that bunch if they are who I think they are. All that that Roman Catholic campaign document had to do with Mrs. Mabel Jones West against me was to sign her name to it. It was told to me at Birmingham, Ala., that she was for Hoover in the campaign and wanted money for her support and did not get it and then went over and supported Governor Smith. The men back of this sneaking and dastardly movement are cowards to try to hide behind Mrs. West. Talk about 30,000 women in Alabama denouncing me for demanding that Roman Catholics shall respect our Protestant and Jew marriages the same as they do Catholic marriages! It is not true. There were not a hundred people present in my State when this fraudulent statement was born. Talk about 30,000 women! There will not be 30,000 votes cast against me in the State. I was nominated in 1924 without opposition, and I do not care whom they run against me. I think they have already picked one individual; I think he had a hand in writing this resolution, with the aid that he got by the way of New York, and probably a suggestion or two from here. I do not know but what some smooth artist in this body may have given a hint as to what should be in the statement [laughter], because the resolution refers to the whole battle line of the American fight that I have made here.

Mr. President, since the time the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] made his speech here about the Mexican war, when he warned the Senate that we were about to be involved in war with Mexico, I followed him and tried to support him with a speech immediately and told about the Roman Catholic Knights of Columbus solemnly passing a resolution in their national convention at Philadelphia denouncing this Government's policy of peace toward Mexico and demanding that it abandon that policy "forthwith." I discussed that. The Senator from Idaho no doubt knew that that Roman Catholic resolution had been passed by the Knights of Columbus at Philadelphia but he never mentioned it—not once. I will be charitable enough to say that he forgot it, but I discussed it time and time again in the Senate until we had sentiment in this body strong enough to vote down any resolution that Rome could bring here to send American boys into Mexico to fight the battles of the Roman Catholic Church, but the Senator from Idaho never discussed it; strange to say, he never mentioned that phase of the subject at all.

On yesterday morning there was an article in the Washington Post, written by Mr. Barger, who is a brilliant and clever writer, who happens to be working, I think, for Roman Catholics, which stated that the Senator from Idaho was introduced last fall during the campaign as "a great Protestant Senator," and that he had been approached time and time again by certain people—Catholics, I take it—about allowing such a thing to happen. Oh, my God, who are we and what are we coming to! No longer, in this great Protestant Nation, can one boast of being an American Protestant without having to apologize to somebody. It was stated the Senator from Idaho had been approached about the subject time and time again, and that it was thought he took advantage of this occasion, when a resolution was pending that defended free speech and peaceful assembly to rebuke those who had sought to murder me, to square himself with the other crowd—the Roman crowd. God of our fathers, where is the statesmanlike courage that inhabited the Members of this body in the great days of the past?

The article also stated that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], because some religious question had been injected into the campaign last fall, had decided to take advantage of this situation to shake it off as much as he could, and that he took advantage of this opportunity for that purpose. In other words, he was apologizing for the stand that Protestant Americans had taken. What is that when it is analyzed? It is an effort to truckle to the Roman Catholics who put the Pope first; it is an effort to obtain political support from that group; and it is an effort to apologize for opposing un-American activities that would destroy free government in America. It

says, in a word, that the "Roman Catholics are organized and dangerous to Protestants that they can not control. You dare not oppose them. You can keep on fooling the Protestants and Jews, but if you want to stay in politics you must obey the mandates of the Roman Catholics." I refuse to do it. Senators, a very serious situation confronts us as Americans charged with the responsibility of preserving this Government. I wanted to say that much this morning, and I am going to offer my resolution in a modified form, and ask the Senate to vote upon it. I ask the clerk to read it. I have rewritten it under the advice of a number of friends in the Senate who think that it covers the subject sufficiently, and relieves it of some of the foreign substance injected into the debate by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from Alabama proposes to modify Senate Resolution 27 so as to read as follows:

Whereas the Senate of the United States should stand firm at all times in its support and protection of the American citizen's sacred right of free speech and peaceful assembly;

Whereas it is alleged by Senator HEFLIN, a member of this body, and supported by press reports, that on the occasion of a public address delivered by him at Brockton, Mass., on the night of March 18, 1929, the right of free speech and peaceful assembly was interfered with, and that a deadly missile was thrown at him in an attempt to do him bodily injury, said missile striking a Brockton policeman in the head and wounding him severely: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep regret of the interference with the American right of free speech and peaceful assembly and of the attempted assault upon Senator HEFLIN, of Alabama, at Brockton, Mass., on the night of March 18, 1929, and hereby expresses its disapproval and condemnation of the conduct of those guilty of the same; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate, in taking this action, is in no way expressing its approval or disapproval of the subject matter of Senator HEFLIN's address on the occasion above referred to.

Mr. HEFLIN. I ask for the yeas and nays upon the resolution.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I raise the point of order that the resolution is not now in order. The subject now before the Senate is the farm relief bill.

Mr. HEFLIN. No.

Mr. WATSON. In accordance with the notice I gave yesterday evening, I now ask unanimous consent, with the consent of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, that the farm relief bill, now before the Senate, may be temporarily laid aside in order that we may take a vote on the Hefflin resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. With the understanding that it shall not lead to long debate, I am willing that the request of the Senator from Indiana shall be complied with.

Mr. HEFLIN. We can vote right now. Let us have the yeas and nays.

Mr. JONES. If it is understood that debate can be had, I shall have no objection. I wish myself to take four or five minutes.

Mr. McNARY. I did not hear the statement of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I object to the consideration of the resolution at this time. I do so on the ground that Congress has been called in session to work out two of the most difficult economic questions that confront our country, and, therefore, I think that it is more according to the duty that devolves upon us to give our consideration to those two problems than here to attempt to consider some personal matter concerning a Senator of the United States or any other individual.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is objection.

Mr. BLAINE. I object to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. BLAINE. I merely wish emphatically to object to the present consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show the fact that agreement was had here day before yesterday that a vote would be taken on my resolution when the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] finished his speech; but another Senator arose on the other side and the Chair recognized him, and that agreement was not carried out.

On yesterday it was understood that when the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER] had finished his speech the Senate would vote on my resolution. The Senator from North Da-

kota spoke quite at length, and when he finished there were, perhaps, not more than a half dozen Senators in the body, most of them being out at lunch, as they usually are at that hour. I did not want to vote on the resolution unless we had a quorum, and so it was agreed to let the resolution go over until this morning, when I rose to a question of privilege. I think every Senator here who is fair-minded will agree that I had a right to do that, to say something about the extraordinary thing that has come in here from my State, and which is a bogus affair and was in part inspired, I am sure, outside. I think I had a right to do that.

If the Senator from Wisconsin wants to object to having a vote on my resolution, of course he has a right to do so; but I now give notice that on to-morrow I shall address the Senate on the Roman-Republican Conspiracy in the Senate.

Mr. President, I desire to have my resolution as modified lie on the table and be considered as pending.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution as modified will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. HEFLIN. Here, Mr. President, I print a list of the Senators who come up for reelection next year—in 1930:

REPUBLICANS (19)

William E. Borah, Boise, Idaho; Arthur Capper, Topeka, Kans.; James Couzens, Birmingham, Mich.; Charles S. Deneen, Chicago, Ill.; Walter E. Edge, Ventnor, N. J.; Frederick H. Gillett, Springfield, Mass.; Guy D. Goff, Clarksburg, W. Va.; Arthur R. Gould, Presque Isle, Me.; Daniel O. Hastings, Wilmington, Del.; Henry W. Keyes, North Haverhill, N. H.; W. H. McMaster, Yankton, S. Dak.; Charles L. McNary, Salem, Oreg.; Jesse H. Metcalf, Providence, R. I.; George W. Norris, McCook, Nebr.; Lawrence C. Phipps, Denver, Colo.; W. B. Pine, Okmulgee, Okla.; Frederic M. Sackett, Louisville, Ky.; Thomas D. Schall, Minneapolis, Minn.; Francis E. Warren, Cheyenne, Wyo.

DEMOCRATS (13)

Cole L. Blease, Columbia, S. C.; Sam G. Bratton, Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Carter Glass, Lynchburg, Va.; William J. Harris, Cedartown, Ga.; Pat Harrison, Gulfport, Miss.; J. Thomas Hefflin, Lafayette, Ala.; Joseph E. Ransdell, Lake Providence, La.; Joseph T. Robinson, Little Rock, Ark.; Morris Sheppard, Texarkana, Tex.; Furnifold McL. Simmons, New Bern, N. C.; Daniel F. Steck, Ottumwa, Iowa; Lawrence D. Tyson, Knoxville, Tenn.; Thomas J. Walsh, Helena, Mont.

CELEBRATION OF SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. VANDENBERG presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Michigan, which was referred to the Committee on the Library:

A concurrent resolution authorizing Republicans of Michigan to join in the celebration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Republican Party July 6, 1929, at Jackson, Mich., and inviting the national organization and leaders of the party to take part therein

Whereas the city of Jackson, Mich., is celebrating the centennial anniversary of its founding July 4, 5, and 6, 1929; and

Whereas the Republican Party was organized under the oaks in the city of Jackson, Mich., July 6, 1854; and

Whereas the committee in charge of the centennial celebration has designated July 6, 1929, one of the days of its centennial celebration as Republican Anniversary Day, and is providing appropriate ceremonies in honor of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the birth of the Republican Party: Be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Michigan (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Republicans of Michigan join with the city of Jackson in arranging a suitable program for the commemoration of the birth of the greatest constructive political party known to the history of the world, and that fitting tribute be provided in said program for the review of the magnificent record of accomplishment of the Republican Party and the unparalleled progress of the Nation made through the guidance of the party's leaders; be it further

Resolved, That the national organization of the Republican Party be invited to join the Republicans of Michigan in this seventy-fifth anniversary celebration, and that an enrolled copy of this resolution be sent to the Hon. Herbert C. Hoover, President of the United States; to the Hon. Calvin Coolidge, ex-President; the Hon. Hubert M. Work, chairman of the Republican National Committee; Members of the United States Senate from the State of Michigan; and to each Congressman from the State of Michigan.

Adopted by the senate March 1, 1929.

LURRIN D. DICKINSON,
President of the Senate.
DENNIS E. ALWARD,
Secretary of the Senate.

Adopted by the house of representatives March 6, 1929.

FRED R. MING,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
MYLES F. GRAY,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 651) granting a pension to Mary E. Haley (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 652) granting a pension to Ermina M. Bridges (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 653) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Brackett (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 654) for the relief of certain persons formerly having interests in Baltimore and Harford Counties, Md.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOFF:

A bill (S. 655) granting a pension to Anna M. Cole; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 656) granting a pension to Mary E. Shaw; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 657) providing for a reduction in the rate of postage on grove and farm products; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 658) providing for the advancement on the retired list of the Army of Hunter Liggett, major general, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 659) granting an increase of pension to Catherine G. Shore; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARAWAY:

A bill (S. 660) extending the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ouachita River, at or near Calion, Ark.;

A bill (S. 661) extending the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Red River at or near Garland City, Ark.;

A bill (S. 662) extending the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the White River at or near Clarendon, Ark.;

A bill (S. 663) extending the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the White River at or near Augusta, Ark.; and

A bill (S. 664) extending the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the White River at or near Cotter, Ark.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

A bill (S. 665) granting an increase of pension to Alice Moore (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A bill (S. 666) to increase the efficiency of the Veterinary Corps of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 667) to amend section 19 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FESS:

A bill (S. 668) to authorize the unification of carriers engaged in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. GOFF:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 23) authorizing the Commissioner of Education to cause to be printed and distributed copies of The American's Creed; to the Committee on Printing.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 43), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized during the Seventy-first Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. SHORTRIDGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 44), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventy-

first Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—ALICE HIPKINS

On motion of Mr. TYDINGS, it was

Ordered, That the papers filed with the bill (S. 2269), Seventieth Congress, first session, entitled "A bill for the relief of Alice Hipkins," be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I ask that I may be excused from further service upon the Joint Committee on Salary Adjustments of Congressional Employees, and that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] be substituted in my place.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I intended to speak to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] before about these committee assignments. I ask that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] be assigned to the Committee on the District of Columbia, to fill the vacancy on behalf of the minority.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I also request that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] be assigned to fill the vacancy on behalf of the minority upon the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. McNARY. May I inquire how many Democrats are now on that committee compared to the Republicans?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. There is still, I think, one vacancy, but I am not sure. I know this vacancy was not filled, I will say to the Senator from Oregon, when we agreed on the committees.

Mr. McNARY. I understand it perfectly now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

"HALF HOURS WITH THE SENATE"

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, on Washington's Birthday the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF] delivered an interesting address explaining the purpose of a weekly radio feature known as "Half Hours With the Senate." This address was delivered over a coast-to-coast hook up of the National Broadcasting Co., and is, I believe, of interest to the Members of the Senate and to the public. I ask that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, Mr. METCALF's radio address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Senator METCALF spoke as follows:

Within another 10 days a mighty office will be bestowed upon a great American. His election was the outcome of the most remarkable political campaign in history. The campaign demonstrated forever the justification of a democratic form of government, not only because nearly 40,000,000 people joined in rendering a single decision, but as well because they became more conversant with the problems of their Government.

This was an important achievement. But it was not alone an act of God nor a development in the science of political education. Rather it was the accomplishment of an army of scientists who have sweated over the mysteries of the unknown and wrested the radio from them. The modern newspaper did its part, as did highly developed transportation. But the voice of the radio reached into new fields and stirred latent minds to a new political awakening.

One of George Washington's fondest dreams was that all his people might have an intimate knowledge of their Government. He was a pioneer in the field of political education and gave much of his fortune that his dream might some day be realized. It is quite fitting, therefore, that on the one hundred and ninety-seventh anniversary of his birth we dedicate this period of broadcasting to carry on the work he began.

This half hour of broadcasting will be brought to the homes of the American people every Friday night at this hour. As chairman of a committee of Senators sponsoring the broadcast, I feel that I should tell you something of its purpose and outline briefly its origin.

As the sovereign power of this country you have every right to know the objectives toward which your Government is striving, and the machinery used to accomplish them. With that in view, a number of my colleagues and I voluntarily agreed to serve on a committee to sponsor a weekly radio broadcast to be known as "Half Hours With

the Senate." The Senate, we felt, was a good barometer of the Government—that by knowing the activities of the Senate you could feel the pulse of Washington.

As chairman of the Senate broadcast committee I conferred with Mr. Aylesworth, president of the National Broadcasting Co., and was assured the hearty cooperation of that organization and its associated radio stations. The committee has spent some three months in careful preparation for the series of broadcasts. We present the first of them to-night and invite your comment.

On this unofficial committee are Senator JOSEPH R. ROBINSON, of Arkansas, minority floor leader of the Senate; Senator MILLARD TYDINGS, of Maryland; and Senator FREDERIC SACKETT, of Kentucky. Russell M. Arundel will serve as its executive secretary and will direct the programs. These men invite two United States Senators to speak to you each week on subjects vital to the country and to the Senate. They will be selected without regard for party lines, and will be asked to speak on subjects with which they are most familiar. We sincerely hope that as the Friday nights go on you will find that this period helps you to carry more easily and intelligently the many responsibilities of citizenship.

For the purpose of giving careful study to legislative responsibilities, the Senate has created more than 30 important committees. There are in addition, numerous subcommittees. Upon these groups rest the burden of analyzing details of legislation to come before the Senate, thereby protecting each of the many interests and sections of the United States against injurious law.

The work of these committees is of stupendous importance. They furnish an opportunity for citizens in all walks of life to express their views on the desirability or the undesirability of a certain bill. Public hearings are held and interested persons invited to state their views on impending bills. Every American citizen has the right to ask to be heard at these hearings. The committees are the sentinels of the Senate, ever on the alert for erroneously conceived bills before they are subjected to debate and vote on the Senate floor.

I will name a few of the more important committees. There is Appropriations, upon which rests the responsibility for studying the appropriations for the great machinery of government. The Finance Committee deals with financial affairs of the Nation, and on it is thrown the task of studying the tariff legislation. There are the Military Affairs and Naval Affairs Committees. Their duties may be discerned from their names. The Interstate Commerce Committee, Foreign Relations Committee, Rules Committee, Agriculture and Forestry Committee, and many others of great importance, are the beehives of activity. They mean work—long, hard hours of work on the part of their members. And in shouldering the problems of Government these committees need your support. For that reason we hope to give you details about them through the medium of these broadcasts.

It is no small task to accurately interpret the spirit and sentiment of a Nation so large as ours. There is no human mind endowed with the capacity to understand the problems peculiar to all sections of the country. You people in Iowa have intricate problems which are entirely foreign to the people of other sections of the Nation. The same is true the country over. It is for that reason that you were given representation in Congress by the Constitution of the United States.

The Senate is confronted with hundreds of problems of a strictly sectional nature. Many of them are of extreme importance to the groups of people concerned. It will be impossible to discuss these problems during this half hour on the air, but we do hope to make you thoroughly acquainted with the method used in dealing with them. Your Senator serves as the interpreter of your sectional problems in the Senate, and to him the rest of us look for guidance in passing upon them. The longer he remains in the Senate the more useful he becomes to the section he represents, not alone because of the influence of seniority, but because of acquired knowledge of the machinery of the body in which he sits.

But there are national problems which are of equal interest to all sections and groups of the Nation. These include dealings with foreign countries, taxation, commercial regulation, and similar affairs of importance. When such problems arise, every Senator is your Senator, and devotes his time and energies for the common interest. It is these problems which necessitate the long debates that sometimes occur in the Senate. The spirit and sentiment of your section of the country is expounded by your Senators, who in turn must listen to the views of Senators representing other sections. In the end the Senate, as a whole, must interpret these various views and render a decision which it believes expresses the attitude of the Nation at large.

In order that you might understand the basis for senatorial debates and the necessity for them, we will endeavor to have them explained to you by prominent Senators during this half hour every Friday night. We want you to know that long debates are the result of your Senators trying to impress the views of your State upon the rest of the Senate.

The machinery which governs these debates will be explained in later broadcasts.

The Senate is unquestionably the most powerful factor in the American machinery of government. There are things which the President and the Senate may do without the consent of the House of Representatives. There are also many powers which both Houses of Congress may use without the consent of the President. The method of operation of this machinery is important to you, the sovereign power of the United States.

The Senate is vested with a measure of all of the three powers of the Federal Government, namely, the legislative, the executive, and judicial. It exercises executive power under the constitutional provision requiring the advice and consent of the Senate on all presidential nominations to Federal office. No treaty may be entered into without the executive approval of two-thirds of the Senate. It has judicial power in that it may sit as a high court of impeachment. Its legislative powers, of course, are well known to all of my invisible audience.

The many responsibilities of the Senate have attracted to that body men who like the idea of constant mental activity. In actuality a United States Senator has a job and not a position. His work is hard, his hours are long, and the duties tedious. It is hard for many to understand why a Senator desires to remain in the Senate when he might earn a much better livelihood in private business with a considerably less effort. But there is a certain fascination about the business of government that grips an active mind and makes it love the necessity for constant activity. There are many Members of the Senate who do not have independent incomes. For these men the Senatorship is a financial burden and the cause for many unavoidable worries. I think if you will study the character of these men you will find that it is love of service which makes them remain here, rather than the desire for glory or political ambitions.

Much of the material you read and hear about the Senate would lead you to believe that it is nothing more nor less than a political potpourri. But you do not hear of the long hours of laborious study in committee rooms, the diligent study required to become thoroughly informed on all manners of complex legislation—in fact, you hear little of the really important work which the Senate is doing. As a rule, the information generally publicized starts with debates on the Senate floor, and that is really the completion of the Senate's legislative work, rather than beginning. The really great accomplishments are in the offices of individuals and in the committee rooms.

We hope to tell you the story of the Senate during these periods of broadcasting. It will not be a dramatic or spectacular story, but a continuous unfolding of the mysteries of government—your Government. It will be simple facts which you have every right to know—and which you should know.

I thank you very kindly for your indulgence, and turn you over to my young friend, Mr. Arundel, who will direct this program.

PROPOSED NICARAGUAN CANAL

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a history of the Nicaraguan canal project which has been prepared by the chief hydrographer to the Panama Canal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The paper presented at the meeting of August 25, 1922, of the Engineers' Club of the Canal Zone, Balboa Heights, regarding the Nicaraguan canal project is here printed, as follows:

HISTORY OF THE NICARAGUAN CANAL PROJECT

By R. Z. Kirkpatrick, chief hydrographer to the Panama Canal

For three centuries and a half an Isthmian canal was a dream of engineers, promoters, statesmen, and financiers. In the old Spanish days of exploitation and conquest it is said King Philip II was vexed at the perverseness of the isthmian geography and topography in that its mere being prevented the consummation of Columbus's dream of straits through to the Pacific coast and the richness thereof. Philip called on the church to send a priest to investigate the Isthmus and report on a feasible route for a canal.

One can imagine the good father's dilemma when he encountered the isthmian jungles, her swamps, rivers, mosquitoes, rains, insects, and mountains. Doubtless he felt that as a location engineer he was a good priest. But he qualified, true to his cloth—and considering the Spaniard's record for constructive work—I think, as an engineer, by a cryptic report: "What God has joined together let no man put asunder." For nearly 400 years that recommendation was a prophecy against various futile ambitious projects.

The Nicaraguan possibility was early recognized. In an early period the English attacked the place, the plan being to occupy the San Juan River and Nicaragua Lake. Having possession they would be in position to later build the canal. They fought the Spaniards about half way to the lake. Malaria set in and the expedition went home. Here Lord Nelson received his first wound and a disability furlough from malaria.

There were many sporadic negotiations with the Central American Republics by the English, French, Dutch, and Americans. The first real reconnaissance was made by an American, Jno. Bailey, in 1837, who designated the general route that was later recommended by the Walker Commission in 1901. The construction of the Panama Railway in 1851 for a time partially filled the need of a transit line. As this was an American company, and a favorable treaty was made with the Republic of New Granada, Congress appropriated money for the passage of mails. General Grant, as a lieutenant, passed over this route in 1855 en route to California, and passed remarks on Panama in his memoirs.

Doniphan and Fremont's expedition across New Mexico to California in the Mexican War spread stories over the United States of the wonders of California. The discovery of gold in 1849 and the Mexican War put the wanderlust into our young men. An easier way to get to California was to cross the Isthmus. Vanderbilt, Garrison, and Morgan, in their steamship lines to Greytown, river steamships up the Rio San Juan and across Lake Nicaragua, stage-coach line to the Pacific, and steamers to San Francisco fastened Nicaragua in American minds as a feasible crossing. It is said 10,000 men crossed Nicaragua in 1849 to 1852. The adventures of the filibusterer Walker gave Nicaragua much advertisement in the United States also. Much of Walker's actions were very discreditable.

The American Atlantic & Pacific Ship Canal Co., of which Commodore Vanderbilt was the owner, sent out Colonel Childs for a survey and report, which was completed in 1852. This was the first real engineering study for a canal. It was submitted to an American and an English engineering commission, separately, who reported the route feasible, with some recommended changes. A concession was granted but finally lapsed.

Various reconnaissances, usually by individuals, often aided by the American Navy, were made in the Darien, Caledonia, in Panama, along the Abrabo, and on the isthmus of Tehuantepec.

In 1872 Commander Crossman, United States Navy, was drowned in a landing on the Nicaraguan coast. His place was taken by Commander Lull and Mr. Menocal, who completed a study of the Childs route. They also studied the Panama route in 1875, checking a survey of Commander Selfridge. They recommended the Nicaraguan route.

Some time afterwards the French started their work in Panama under De Lesseps.

Eads, of St. Louis bridge fame, in 1881 proposed a 4-track ship marine railroad at Tehuantepec. This method of shifting ships from ocean to ocean attracted much discussion.

In 1884 a treaty was signed for a jointly owned canal by Nicaragua and the United States. Menocal expanded the Childs and Lull surveys by further investigations for the Navy Department. It is worthy of note that his principal assistant was Lieutenant Peary, afterwards the discoverer of the North Pole. The American Senate refused to ratify this treaty.

In April, 1887, Menocal and others were given a concession to build a canal from Greytown to Brito, under the name of the Maritime Canal Co. They formed a construction company, built unloading wharves, a 950-foot jetty, cleared 45 miles, built 15 miles of railway, did some canal dredging, built shops, hospitals, etc., working over three years and spending several millions of dollars. Financial difficulties, without the expected help from the American Government, wrecked them, and the old machinery is rusting now in eastern Nicaraguan jungles north of the San Juan River.

In 1895 the Ludlow Commission was appointed to collate all data and report on the Nicaraguan route. The board was reconstituted under the name of the Nicaraguan Canal Commission and given more time in 1897, Admiral Walker being put in as head. They reported favorably to the Nicaraguan route in 1899, after making careful studies, designs, and estimates. This work was thoroughly done and included a study of the Panama route, now part way finished by the French.

By 1887 financial scandals had occurred with the first French company in Panama, building under a sea-level plan, and the company became insolvent. During the period of liquidation a board of engineers made further studies of the Panama Canal and a second French company undertook the work of the Panama Canal, under a plus 55-foot lock-level system, with a dam at Bohio. Soon the second company was in financial difficulties.

The Spanish-American War, with the Oregon's trip around the Horn, had concentrated American interest, and it was evident an American canal was to be built somewhere. The Walker Commission was inclined to favor the Nicaraguan route for a canal 30 feet deep, 150 feet wide, and 665-foot locks 80 feet wide. The commission was partly reconstituted—with Admiral Walker still head—and told to make a parallel and comparative study of the Nicaraguan and Panaman routes.

In their preliminary report they favored the Nicaraguan route; they declared that the French price for their work was too high; that because of this it was better to take the other route under the more favorable treaty to be had with Nicaragua. At this juncture the

French company voted to accept \$40,000,000 for their holdings, and the commission reported favorably to the Panama route. The failure of the Colombian Senate to ratify the Hay-Herran treaty resulted in the successful revolution of Panama, and the Spooner Act became applicable to the Americans building on the Panama route through ratification of the favorable Varilla-Hay treaty. As a result, this audience is in Ancon, Canal Zone, to-night instead of at Brito, Nicaragua.

Comparison of Panama and Nicaraguan routes

PANAMA	NICARAGUA
1. Two good harbors existing.	Two harbors to be created; one (Greytown) presents unusual difficulties.
2. Panama railroad already built.	Long railroad would have to be built along whole line, except across Nicaragua Lake, 120 miles long.
3. Some of the actual French work could be used.	Much to be done in getting data; practically nothing done in construction.
4. Rainfall from 70 to 140 inches.	Half the work in region with rainfall from 140 to 300 inches.
5. Region wholly in one country with favorable treaty for United States.	Route on border of Costa Rica, with local jealousies, and not complete control by United States.
6. Distance to be lighted and maintained, 49 miles.	Distance to be lighted and maintained, 181 miles, about four times the length of Panama Canal.
7. No active volcanoes within 200 miles from canal and no serious earthquakes. No damage to buildings on record.	Active volcanoes near route; Ometepe, in Lake Nicaragua, about 40 miles from a lock. Earthquakes common; buildings show same.
8. Cost \$375,000,000 for actual construction; about \$500,000,000 for everything.	Conjectural; originally thought to be about one-third more than Panama Canal.
9. Time of transit, 6 to 10 hours.	Not less than 36 hours.
10. Summit level, 80 to 85 feet.	Summit level, 110 to 115 feet.
11. Double locks, six in all, three flights to a side.	Double locks, eight in all; four flights to a side.
12. Curvature gentle; sharpest curve at La Pita.	Curvature sharp. In 68 miles traverse in San Juan River somewhat circuitous. In 47 miles necessary to travel 67.
13. No troublesome winds nor river currents.	Heavy trade winds and river currents.
14. Deep water through Lake Gatun, 25 miles.	Deep water through Lake Nicaragua—45 to 70 miles.
15. Panama not susceptible to much improvement as a country.	Nicaragua has great possibilities agriculturally.
16. Coast fortifications easily made on outlying islands.	Not so good on eastern coast.
17. In American coastwise trade Panama is 300 to 500 miles longer.	Advantage mostly offset by greater time in transit.

DATA ON NICARAGUA

Nicaragua contains 51,700 square miles, with 600,000 people; it has about the area of Alabama or North Carolina, with a population equal to that of Pittsburgh or San Francisco.

Lake Nicaragua is the largest lake between Lake Erie and Bolivia; it is 103 miles long; area, 3,000 square miles, about twenty-five times the area of Lake Gatun; its drainage area is over 6,000 square miles. The elevation of the lake is from 100 to 115 feet above the sea.

Lake Managua is about 25 miles from Lake Nicaragua. It is about 125 feet above the sea and has an area of 490 square miles, equal to three Gatun Lakes. It has a drainage area of 3,000 square miles.

The lakes are connected by Rio Tipitapa, which river seldom flows. Lake Managua probably has subterranean connections that allow water to escape to Lake Nicaragua and to the Pacific Ocean. Its course is through a country of rainfall from 150 to 300 inches a year. The main tributaries are from Costa Rica; of three, the Rio San Carlos is the greatest and carried large quantities of sediment.

(The remainder of this lecture was from lantern slides and pictures by lantern projection that can not be reproduced here. It showed the canal alignment, probable construction difficulties, the details of the design of the dam and spillway at Conchuda, the location of the portion of the San Juan River proposed to be canalized, and the eight lock sites, four lock lifts on each ocean slope. There were several pictures showing means of local transportation, life of the people in the interior, the terminal dock for importing and exporting goods at Corinto.)

The table below, showing the relative distances traveled by ships using the Nicaragua or Panama routes, was thrown on the screen by lantern projection:

Comparison of distances saved by Nicaragua or Panama Canal

From—	To—	Distances		Saving	
		Via Nicaragua	Via Panama	By Nicaragua	By Panama
		Miles	Miles	Miles	Miles
San Francisco	New York	5,040	5,340	300	
Do	Liverpool	7,700	8,080	310	
Do	New Orleans	4,240	4,740	500	
Yokohama	New York	10,870	11,050	180	
Do	New Orleans	10,070	10,450	380	
Guayaquil	New York	3,370	2,910		460
Do	Liverpool	6,100	5,650		450
Do	New Orleans	2,560	2,300		260

It was pointed out that the longer time of passage through the Nicaraguan canal partly absorbs the saving in mileage shown above.

FARM RELIEF

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to establish a Federal farm board to aid in the orderly marketing, and in the control and disposition of the surplus, of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], which will be stated.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator desire to have the amendment read?

Mr. COPELAND. No. May I say, Mr. President, that in my opinion the better procedure would be to have a direct vote on the debenture matter. If there be no objection, I think I will withdraw my amendment for the moment, although I desire to leave it upon the table, and shall call it up after the debenture matter is disposed of should the debenture plan not be agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the pending bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana offers an amendment, which will be read for the information of the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to discuss the pending amendment; but as a parliamentary situation I think the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] must either dispose of his amendment or withdraw it. The mere statement that he does not want to have it considered now, but desires to leave it on the table to be called up at his pleasure, gets us nowhere in an attempt to legislate.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I realize that I am at liberty to offer my amendment at any time, and I am convinced that the better procedure is to deal with the debenture matter first. So that there may be no misunderstanding or parliamentary tangle, I ask permission to withdraw the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Oregon a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. McNARY. I do.

Mr. HARRISON. Does the Senator from Oregon contemplate offering an amendment to strike the debenture plan from the bill?

Mr. McNARY. That was done just a moment ago by the distinguished leader, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, pending the stating of the amendment—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I inquire of the Senator from Indiana whether it is his desire to proceed to the consideration of this amendment now?

Mr. WATSON. That, I should say, would depend upon the wish of the chairman of the committee, because the bill has not yet been read, and I was informed by him this morning that he intends to ask for the reading of the bill. I suppose that when it is reached in regular order it might then be taken up, if that be agreeable to the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, it is my judgment that it would not be fair to consider a motion to strike out the debenture plan this morning.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I think that motion certainly can not be disposed of prior to some time next week. Of course, I think all Senators know that I have no disposition to delay consideration of or action on this bill. I want to facilitate it; but I think those who expect to speak on the bill generally and who are ready to do so should proceed with their discussion.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I have no objection to the amendment being offered at this time; but before it is voted on I desire to call attention to the fact that I have an amendment which I have had printed and which is now on the clerk's desk, though it has not been formally offered yet, and which is an amendment to the language that the Senator from Indiana undertakes to strike out, and, of course, as a parliamentary proposition, it should take precedence, even though that amendment may be pending. I have no desire to offer it now unless the Senator from Indiana desires to offer his amendment, because I have anticipated that a good many Senators wish to discuss the bill in a general way, and I did not want to take any action which would interfere with that discussion. Before the Senator's amendment is voted on to strike out the so-called debenture provisions, however, it will be in order, of course, even though that announcement is pending, to move to amend the provisions he seeks to strike out, which I intend to do. I am willing to do it now, but I do not care to interfere with those Senators who desire to discuss the bill in a general way.

Mr. HARRISON, Mr. HEFLIN, and Mr. SMITH addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield; and to whom?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. Just in order that the situation may be clarified, may I ask the Senator from Indiana if he has made this motion to strike out the debenture plan in order to offer another amendment that he got some of us in the last Congress to be for and which he so strongly and sincerely advocated, namely, the equalization fee?

Mr. WATSON. When the proper time comes I shall take great pleasure in informing my friend on that subject, I hope to his instruction, and certainly to his delight.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. In this connection, may I ask the Senator from Indiana, if the debenture provisions in the bill are stricken out, whether he intends to propose or to support a proposal to incorporate in the bill the equalization-fee plan, which he so strongly advocated at the last session?

Mr. WATSON. I will say to my friend that I do not.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator has concluded that the equalization plan is wrong?

Mr. WATSON. I will explain all that when the time comes, but I can not do it in a single sentence.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I am asking the Senator to explain it now. Of course, the Senator probably will require a great deal of time to explain it—

Mr. WATSON. No.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. And will encounter a great deal of difficulty in making his explanation. May I ask the Senator to state now what it is that has brought about the change in the spirit of his dreams in connection with the equalization fee?

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WATSON. I offered the amendment that I have offered, not that it may be considered now, I will say to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], but rather as an amendment that I shall propose at the proper time, having no thought that it would be debated now or taken up now for consideration.

I will say to my distinguished friend from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and also to the genial Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] that when I debate that amendment I shall explain why I am not for the debenture and not for the incorporation of the equalization fee in this bill, but this is not the time for such an explanation.

Mr. HEFLIN and Mr. McNARY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield; and to whom?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HEFLIN. I was going to ask the Senator from Oregon, this being Friday, if we could not agree to take up this matter

on Monday, when all the Senators would be apprised of the time at which it would be taken up?

Mr. McNARY. About which matter does the Senator speak?

Mr. HEFLIN. The motion to strike out the debenture plan.

Mr. McNARY. I think that probably is too early, Mr. President. There are a number of Members of the Senate, including some members of the committee, who desire to address the Senate on this question; and it will come up in the usual way if the Senate may have all the time for the consideration of the farm bill.

Now, Mr. President, let me make a suggestion to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator has a right, of course, to perfect the debenture provisions by offering his amendment. I should like to see that brought about at this time, so that when the motion of the Senator from Indiana comes before the Senate the debenture plan will then be in a form conforming to the views of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. It is perfectly agreeable to me to offer the amendment at any time. As I said before, I did not formally offer it because, as is usually the case in bills of this importance, there will be considerable general debate, and I did not want to interfere with that and crowd out those Senators who wanted to talk in a general way on the question involved.

My own idea is, however, that the amendment which I shall offer will not be objected to by the chairman of the committee or by any Member of the Senate who is in favor of the debenture plan. I do not believe it will be objected to by those who are opposed to the plan, because it is an honest effort on my part to put into the debenture plan something that I think all friends of the measure will agree ought to be put in the provision in some form. My amendment may not be the way in which the Senate will conclude that it ought to be done, and therefore it may excite considerable debate.

If the Senator from Arkansas will permit me—

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I will state in a general way that, after the committee had reported this bill, until I read it in the Senate, I supposed that the amendment I propose to offer was already in the bill. I find on looking it up, however, that I was wrong about it. It was not formally put in. It deals with the question of overproduction.

I believe that those who have given the question any study will agree that there ought to be something in the measure which would prevent the payment of the entire debenture fee in case the law results in bringing about an increased production, a stimulation of production, that is unreasonable. Briefly, this amendment provides that if the board having charge of the matter find before the beginning of any crop year, by an examination of the 5-year average of production of that particular crop, that there has been an increase of production which exceeds 20 per cent, then a reduction in the payment of the debenture commences, and as the production increases the debenture payments decrease. The object of it is to prevent an overproduction. The amendment provides that if the production is not stimulated to the amount of 20 per cent, then the reduction shall not be put in operation.

I am perfectly willing to offer the amendment now, if the chairman of the committee and others think that would be the best way to proceed.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I think the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Nebraska very much improves the debenture plan. I think we should have that plan before the Senate in a perfected form before we consider the whole subject matter; and I shall be very happy if the Senator will present at this time his amendment to the debenture plan, in order that we may have it before us in its perfected form.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Oregon a question?

Mr. McNARY. I shall be very glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. If the debenture provision is modified as suggested by the Senator from Nebraska, is it the intention of the chairman of the committee reporting the bill to support the plan?

Mr. McNARY. Not at all.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. And if the debenture plan is stricken out, does the Senator from Oregon intend to support the amendment to incorporate the equalization fee, which he so strongly advocated last session; or does he intend to join the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] in some process of explanation why the equalization fee was good then, but is bad now?

Mr. McNARY. I intend to join the administration in opposing both the equalization fee and the debenture plan, because I want a bill passed and signed at this session which I believe will be beneficial to agriculture.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. If I understand the Senator from Oregon correctly, then, he is opposing the equalization fee and the debenture plan because the administration—I presume he means the President—is opposed to both of them. Is that correct?

Mr. McNARY. I stated very plainly that sometimes you must forego your own views in order to get legislation.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. And I am in this attitude: I want Congress to pass a bill that will be signed, and such a bill, in my opinion, will be of great benefit to agriculture. If it proves to be weak and ineffective, I will join the distinguished Senator from Arkansas in putting into it some provision that will do the job.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Yes; but, Mr. President, we have been dealing with this question now for 12 years, or almost that long; and at every session we say, "If we do not do anything now we will do something at some other time." When is the day coming when we shall take decisive action and pass a measure of farm relief that will eliminate this question from politics, and provide whatever relief can be afforded?

I understand that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] wants to perpetuate it. He has thrived on it, and thinks he will continue to do so. It does not make any difference to the Senator from Indiana whether the equalization fee fails or succeeds, so long as the farm relief question is in the politics of the country, and gives him an opportunity to carry on his successful propaganda in campaigns.

Mr. WATSON and Mr. BORAH addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Senators can favor freedom of religion, freedom of conscience, freedom of expression in the Senate of the United States when there is no political issue pending, but we never heard even the Senator from Idaho talking about freedom of conscience while the last campaign was in progress, when that was supposed to be an issue. He was then as dumb as an oyster on that dominant and overshadowing question.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] were the champions of the equalization fee. They told us that it did not matter if Mr. Coolidge, the Republican President, had vetoed a bill embodying the equalization fee; that provision was fair and just; that it imposed upon the units marketed and benefited the costs of the operations in those units; that a great economic question was involved.

The Senator from Indiana was so interested in the subject that he sent to a foreign country, secured the opinion of a great economist in Great Britain, and offered it in the Senate as an evidence of the fact that the equalization fee was sound economically, and he maintained that it was wise politically, at that particular time. But now, after the election, he comes here and says that some day, some time, he will tell the Senate why he is against the equalization fee, why he was wrong when he stood here and appealed to the Senate to ignore or override the head of the administration.

The Senator from Oregon tells us that the administration—which I presume means the President, although I had always understood that both the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Oregon are material, if not indispensable, parts of the administration—is against that plan, and for that reason he is against the equalization fee, which he so strongly espoused in previous sessions. President Coolidge was against the equalization fee, and he vetoed the first farm relief bill which passed the Senate, under the leadership of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], and notwithstanding the veto the Senator came back with a second bill embracing the equalization fee substantially in the same form in which it had been vetoed. I assume that he took the position then that the President was wrong. The gallant Senator from Indiana took this floor, and in one of his most eloquent and forceful, if unconvincing, speeches insisted upon the adoption of the bill the second time with the equalization fee the outstanding provision in it.

Mr. CARAWAY. And it was a written speech.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. It was a speech that had been prepared with great care. There is something remarkable about

the circumstance when the Senator from Indiana takes the trouble to prepare a speech. Ordinarily he does not seem to care what he says. He speaks with great fluency and ease, but when the McNary-Haugen bill passed the Senate for the second time, the Senator from Indiana stood near where he is now sitting and, with a fervor and an enthusiasm which aroused suspicion then, and which is utterly inexplicable now, he championed the provision as sound economically and politically wise.

Now, when I ask him the reason for his change, why it is he is so bitterly opposed to the provision which he asked us to support in previous sessions of the Congress, he says, "Oh, I will explain that some time," and, of course, he will, for a Senator possessing the mental ingenuity which the Senator from Indiana so often displays can explain any inconsistency in his own conduct, at least to his own satisfaction.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am anxious to understand what the program is to be with reference to to-day's work, particularly as it is related to this amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that in accordance with the wish expressed by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, I am only waiting, and as soon as I can get the floor I intend to offer my amendment.

Mr. BORAH. Then we will proceed with the discussion of it to-day?

Mr. NORRIS. I presume so.

Mr. BORAH. Very well.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I now offer the amendment to which I have referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska offers the following amendment, which the clerk will report.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, after line 16, insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 10a. In order to prevent undue stimulation in the production of any debenturable agricultural commodity, whenever the board finds prior to the beginning of a crop year that the probable production of any debenturable agricultural commodity during such crop year will exceed the average annual production of such debenturable agricultural commodity for the preceding five years, it shall by proclamation prescribe that the export debenture rates for such commodity shall be reduced by the percentage hereinafter fixed. Such reductions shall become effective on the date fixed in such proclamation, not less than 60 days from the date of the issuance thereof, and shall remain in effect throughout such crop year. The term "crop year," as used in this section, means a 12-month period beginning at a time designated by the board.

Reductions in debenture rates under this section shall be made in accordance with the following percentages:

- (1) For an estimated increase in production of less than 20 per cent, there shall be no reduction.
- (2) For an estimated increase in production of 20 per cent but less than 40 per cent, there shall be a reduction of 20 per cent.
- (3) For an estimated increase in production of 40 per cent but less than 60 per cent, there shall be a reduction of 50 per cent.
- (4) For an estimated increase in production of 60 per cent but less than 90 per cent, there shall be a reduction of 75 per cent.
- (5) For an estimated increase in production of 90 per cent, or more, there shall be a reduction of 99 per cent.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. COPELAND. Did the Senator from Indiana withdraw his amendment, or is the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska intended to be an amendment to that amendment?

Mr. NORRIS. There is no amendment pending, as I understand it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana did not offer his amendment. There is no amendment pending except the one now offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, let me say, to begin with, that I am not going to ask, and I hope nobody else will, that the Senate vote on this amendment to-day. As far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to vote on it now, but several Senators have spoken to me about it and have asked me about the percentage reductions contained in the amendment. Some of them want more time to think about it, and some of them want time to examine some records and to look into the matter, to see whether these percentages are correct.

I have made no examination as to the percentages and I invite discussion. These rates are only tentative. I offer the amendment because I believe some provision of the kind included in the amendment ought to be included in any debenture plan.

The first objection made to the debenture plan I think was made by myself 8 or 10 years ago when it was first proposed before the committee, and my objection was that it was quite

evident that the plan, unless something of this kind were included in it, would result in a very material increase in the production of any article to which the debenture plan might be applied, where such a thing was possible.

The limitation of overproduction, or of increased production that would be unreasonable, was provided for in former bills. The so-called McNary-Haugen bill, by the equalization fee, met that proposition by providing that the farmers themselves, in case overproduction of any particular product resulted on account of stimulus which might be given to that crop, would have to bear the loss by the fact that the equalization fee would be larger, and that the loss on the exportable surplus would be larger, all of which would be taken out of the sales of the crop to which the equalization applied.

I have only followed that plan. My amendment puts that idea into the bill. Without the amendment there is nothing in the bill which has any restraint upon any overproduction that might be brought about by reason of the debenture plan being applied to any farm product.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator permit me to ask a question and to make a suggestion?

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. I agree with the purpose the Senator has in mind in offering the amendment, but the amendment provides that "whenever the board finds, prior to the beginning of the crop year, that the probable production of any debenturable agricultural commodity during such crop year will exceed the average annual production of such debenturable agricultural commodity for the preceding five years," then this sliding scale shall go into effect. The Senator bases the scale, therefore, on the production. Would it not be much better to base it upon an increased acreage in that particular crop? In other words, will not the Senator's amendment deny the benefits of the debenture plan when the farmer most needs it; that is, when there is a probable high production in the particular year, not based necessarily upon any increased acreage, but due to an extraordinary crop production?

Mr. NORRIS. In answer to the Senator, who has propounded a very fair question, I would like to say that as I understand the operation of the bill in case it should become a law the estimates made by the board would be made to a great extent, not entirely perhaps, upon the acreage of the particular crop. They would undoubtedly take that into consideration. It might be and probably would be in most cases the predominating influence in making the estimate. Of course the board would be up against the proposition that their estimate might fail. They would have to make it before the crop is harvested.

The number of acres is one of the considerations in making the estimate. The condition of the crop at the time they make the estimate is another important consideration. It necessarily must be an estimate because it must be made and the rate must be fixed before the crop is harvested. I would not want to limit the board in making the estimate to an acreage proposition entirely because sometimes I think that would result in a great injustice, although it is perfectly open and they can give whatever consideration they see fit to the acreage which has been planted.

Mr. GEORGE. Of course I know the board would take into consideration the increase in acreage, but standing as the Senator's amendment does, it really would deny the farmer the benefit of the debenture plan, that is, the full debenture, in those particular years when extraordinary seasons brought about a heavy production.

It seems to me that the element of intentional increase of production should be the controlling element the Senator aims to regulate or to curb by his amendment; that is, where the farmers have intentionally and deliberately and designedly sought to bring about an increased production, and not that extraordinary increase in production which might result from an extraordinarily favorable growing season and curing season.

I recognize, of course, the difficulty the Senator has in framing the amendment. I fully sympathize with the purpose he has in mind, but it does seem to me that the board ought not to be allowed to scale the debenture down when there has been no intention or effort upon the part of the farmer to bring about the extraordinary increase.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the board, as I understand it, will not be able under any circumstances to look into the minds and hearts of men who have sown, for instance, a crop of wheat and ascertain whether they have intentionally undertaken unduly to increase the production.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator does not mean that if there has been an increase in acreage it would be a fact the board should not consider?

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no; that would be a proper thing for them to consider. But the board would have to make the estimate 60 days before the crop was harvested. In the month of January we might be able to ascertain that down in the State of Kansas there was a complete failure of the wheat crop. The weather might have been such that they would estimate that in Kansas for the coming year there would be only a 10 per cent crop. They might find a similar condition in some other section. I am speaking of the wheat-growing portion of the country. They would take all those things into consideration, of course, in making the estimate. If they were limited entirely to acreage, they would be debarred from considering things which are perfectly self-evident, and anyone undertaking to estimate what the crop was going to be would have to leave out of the equation a very valuable and important consideration.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. KENDRICK. I want to ask the Senator if, in the interest of fairness to producers, he does not believe that the right to suspend the payment of the debenture should be dependent upon one year's notice to the producers, in order that they might make their plans accordingly in planting their crops?

Mr. NORRIS. That, of course, would nullify any attempt, as I understand the question, to put anything of this kind into operation. Necessarily we could not give an intelligent guess one year in advance as to what the crop was going to be. We would have to have something on which to base the estimate.

Mr. KENDRICK. The thought which suggests itself to my mind is that the board, keeping in close touch with the situation, could at least notify producers that there would be a suspension of payment in case there was a crop larger than normal planted.

Mr. NORRIS. They could do that under this plan, I think. The board could very properly say to the country, "If, when the time comes to make this estimate, we find that the crop of wheat, for instance, is going to be increased more than 20 per cent, we will issue the proclamation." That would cut off the 20 per cent of the debenture.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. I want to ask the Senator whether it is his opinion that unless there is imposed a check on production, such as he proposes by the amendment, the adoption of the debenture plan as now incorporated in the bill would cause a stimulation of production so as to increase the surplus?

Mr. NORRIS. I do. I think all students of the subject will agree to that.

Mr. GEORGE and Mr. WAGNER addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to no one further now. I want to explain my answer to the question of the Senator from New York.

I am not one of those who are frightened at overproduction. I can see that there might come a danger in it, but it must follow that there will be some increased production under any plan we have. If we strike the debenture provisions from the bill and the balance of the bill does any good for the farmers of America, it will result in some increase of production.

What are we trying to do? We are trying to get for the producer of food products an increased price. Is not that the object of the legislation? Is not that the object of this special session of Congress? What other object has anybody in view if we want to help the farmer in the predicament in which he finds himself? If he gets a better price, the tendency will be to raise more of the product. The farmers who have studied the proposition are, I think, unanimous in agreeing that in common justice there ought to be some provision in the bill which would penalize or reduce its benefits in case the bill resulted in an unreasonable stimulation in the production of any particular crop.

I said a while ago that when the first bill was introduced, as I remember it now, it had nothing of this kind in it. It seemed to me that it was a serious omission. I talked with those behind it many times and called their attention to that point. One of the greatest farm organizations, the oldest in the United

States, commenced to study it. They did it with the assistance of experts. They had been studying it for several years. At their request, after they had prepared the bill, it was introduced in the House of Representatives. It was a bill which they themselves prepared after several years of study. They put in this provision, not in the exact form in which I have offered it, because it would not fit into this bill if it were worded just as they had it.

These percentages have not originated with me. The percentages I have in my amendment originated with the National Grange. They are the result of their study, honest and conscientious as everybody knows, and the result of their belief after making that study that some provision of this kind should be put into their own bill. As they prepared it they had it in the bill.

So those who are more responsible for the debenture plan than any other combination or organization of men themselves advocate some provision of this kind and they themselves, after that study, advocated the identical percentages which I have included in the amendment. The percentages may be wrong. Perhaps they are too great. It may be that in applying the percentages to a bill which gives to the farmer only one-half of the benefit of the tariff it will be found that the deductions ought not to be so great as they are here. I am rather inclined to that view myself. I think if I were making a criticism of the particular amendment that is one of the things which would first come to my attention.

Remember that the debenture plan in this bill does no purport to give the farmer the benefit of the entire tariff like the manufacturer gets it. It only proposes to give him one-half of the existing tariff. The tariff on wheat, for instance, is 42 cents a bushel and the bill gives him 21 cents. In effect, as far as the farmer is concerned, by this bill we would amend the tariff act and cut it in two in the middle as far as the producers are concerned. I, myself, do not believe that that is justice. If I were advocating the thing as an original proposition and the atmosphere were cleared of some of the objections and it were not a matter of policy of getting it into law, I would say that the farmer ought to have, instead of the 21 cents on wheat, the full 42 cents which the law provides that he should have.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. NORRIS. I will yield in just a moment. That as applied to a manufactured article, if the rate were the same, would be 42 cents instead of 21 cents. But the farmers who are behind the proposition realize fully the powerful opposition against such a proposition. They realize fully the immense political and financial forces which are opposed to giving the farmer the benefit of a protective tariff. They themselves have said, "We will accept one-half of the tariff, and try it." I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I wish to supplement the statement of the Senator from Nebraska by this observation: It is true that all other dutiable agricultural products would receive the benefit of one-half the tariff, but in the case of cotton there is fixed a flat rate of 2 cents a pound.

Mr. NORRIS. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his suggestion.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. Let me answer the suggestion made by the Senator from Oregon, and then I will gladly yield to the Senator from Michigan.

As we all know, cotton is on the free list. It is one of the most important, if not, indeed, the most important agricultural product of the country. The cotton farmer, together with the wheat farmer, and equally with the wheat farmer, stands in need of relief, and is demanding relief for the same reason that the producers of other farm products are demanding relief. If we had not some specific provision in the bill that applied to cotton, and which did not apply to anything else, then the cotton farmer would get no benefit whatever. So in the bill—not in my amendment but in the bill—there is now a provision fixing the debenture on cotton at 2 cents a pound.

Again, it was shown, I think, without controversy before the committee that the debenture of 2 cents a pound on cotton was scaled down, was cut in two, from what it ought to be in order to make it comparable with the debenture that was put on other products. I think I state that correctly. There are several members of the committee here who heard the evidence on that subject, as I did, and heard the matter discussed in executive session of the committee. If I am wrong in that statement, or in any other, I shall be glad to have any Senator interrupt and correct me. Now I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am anxious to get the judgment of the Senator from Nebraska on the question which I submitted to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER] on yesterday. Would the debenture plan produce an actual advantageous net result for the farmer if it were met by a countervailing duty of any kind abroad?

Mr. NORRIS. What does the Senator mean by "duty of any kind abroad"?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am referring not to the antidumping law, but to the supplemental laws which attack particularly so-called bounty-fed goods, such laws as those of Belgium, which provide that any goods that enjoy a direct or indirect bounty on export must immediately submit to a countervailing duty equal to the bounty. The same type of legislation exists in Austria, France, Portugal, Switzerland, Japan, Argentina, Australia, and so forth; and all such laws are paraphrases of section 303 of our own tariff law, under which we would do precisely the same thing if the situation were reversed.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not believe we would do the same thing under our law. I had intended to discuss that very proposition later on; it does not particularly apply to my amendment so far as I am aware; but since the Senator has asked the question I am going briefly to give him my idea in regard to it.

If we had no tariff and other than agricultural products were not protected, I would not be advocating the debenture plan. I never did advocate it up until we failed in everything else; I never did advocate it until we had tried to secure the enactment of a bill by which the farmer himself could stand his own loss, by which the operations of the farmer financed the loss and financed it all. Those measures all failed, and we were confronted with the proposition, admitted by all, that the farmer was not getting justice under our tariff law. It was admitted by every student of the subject, from the President down, that the farmer was not getting what he was justly entitled to; that he was living in a world of protection and was selling his surplus products in a world of free trade; that he was buying on this side of the tariff wall and selling on the other side of the tariff wall, which was an injustice admitted to exist. Since every other plan had failed, since we were not able to overcome the objections in higher quarters to letting the farmer stand his own loss, stand on his own feet, I reached the conclusion, as I think did the committee, that there was only one thing left to do.

Now, I come directly to an answer, I think, to the Senator's question. What are we trying to do? We are trying to put the farmer under the protective-tariff umbrella. It is a leaky umbrella, it is true; half of the rain will come through; but we are trying to put him in the same class with the manufacturers. We have a protective tariff system that covers practically everybody except the farmer. So we propose to take the farmer and put him, for the purpose of argument I will say, on an equal basis; but, as I have already said, he will get only half of the tariff. We propose to put his industry into the class of protected industries; but, in order to put him into that class, we must take something that comes from the other industries which are protected and give it, either directly or indirectly, to the farmer himself when he exports his products. So what we are proposing to do here is to take the funds that come from our protective-tariff system and equalize them among all those whom we are trying to put into the system.

It is said that this is the same as paying the money out of the Treasury; I have said so; and to the extent of the tariff on imports it is true. If the imports of other products which pay a tariff should fall off so that the total revenue were less than the amount that would be necessary to pay the debentures, the whole plan would fail; it would not be a success. In other words, there is no right to go beyond the tariff in order to compensate the farmer, and put him on an equality with other industries. He is put in the same class with them, and while the money required for the debentures comes from public money as it is traveling on its way to the Treasury and is intercepted, the legal effect is the same as though it had gone in and then was taken out. I admit that. Nevertheless that process can only proceed so long as there is sufficient money coming from the other protected industries to pay the farmer what he ought to have in order to be placed on an equality with the other industries.

Mr. McNARY. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me to make a request for unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. NORRIS. I have no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. Before the Senator from Michigan interrupts me again will he allow me to answer his question a little further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I very frankly concede that any government in the world, being dissatisfied with our laws, could enact retaliatory measures. It could pass a law which provided that it would not permit the importation of any commodity within its borders from a country which had a protective tariff on anything. Belgium or any other nation could say, "There shall be no imports from the United States of any kind," without giving any reason for its action if it desired so to do; that government is supreme so far as such matters are concerned; but let me tell the Senator from Michigan that this debenture plan is now in operation in Germany and has been in operation there for years. It has not resulted in undue stimulus.

Mr. BORAH. It was in operation in England for some time.

Mr. NORRIS. As the Senator from Idaho reminds me, the plan was in operation in England for a good while. It is in operation, as I understand, in Sweden at this time, although I am not sure as to that.

Mr. BORAH. It is.

Mr. NORRIS. So that other countries have applied this system. We have not seen fit to take any advantage of it.

The object is not to give a bonus to this man or that man, although it may result in that, but the object is to equalize our producers one with the other. Taking the farmer as a manufacturer, the object is to equalize manufacturers in the benefits which they shall derive from the protective tariff; that is all.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Why should foreign governments be incited to punish us in the manner suggested by the Senator from Michigan for putting on a debenture any more than they would be incited to such action by our levying high tariff duties on imported articles?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I was not questioning the economic justice of such a system. I was merely asking the practical question as to whether or not if the laws against bounty-fed goods which exist abroad were invoked the invocation of such laws would not negative and neutralize the advantage of the debenture. I am asking as to the practical effect of such a system.

Mr. NORRIS. I will state frankly to the Senator that, in my judgment, a foreign country could cite this particular measure, if we should enact it, and could retaliate against us. It would be up to us then to see if we could not retaliate against them.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Would the debenture system at that point still bring the American farmer an advantage?

Mr. NORRIS. I think so; I do not see why it would not.

Mr. President, as I said in the beginning, I did not intend at this time to discuss the debenture plan. I may do that later as the discussion proceeds and as it seems advisable. I merely arose to explain the amendment, but was led into a general discussion by the question of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator need not do that, because his question was a very proper one, although it did not apply to the particular amendment I have offered.

I should like to have Senators get all the information they can in regard to this particular matter. When this plan was first proposed years ago there was no attempt to limit it to one-half of the tariff, and until recently the contention was that the farmer should be given the full benefit of the tariff. I am not sure as to that, but I think I can secure the information, and I am going to try to get it if I have time before the vote shall be taken, but until recently the idea had not occurred to those behind it to limit the operations of the plan to half of the tariff. As a matter of fact, if we cut it down to one-half of the tariff, to be consistent, we ought to increase the percentages.

It will be noticed from the amendment that if the 5-year increase is less than 20 per cent no reduction can take place; so that there can be a reasonable increase. We must allow for some increase; we must expect some increase; it is only natural that an increase should come.

Mr. President, if there are no questions which Senators desire to ask at the present time in regard to the amendment itself, I have said all I now care to say.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I give notice of my intention to offer an amendment to the pending bill, which I ask may be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires to discuss the unfinished business at this time, I ask unanimous consent that the agreement of a few moments ago be carried out by an adjournment until Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the Senate stands in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, adjourned until Monday, April 29, 1929, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, April 26, 1929

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, Thou art a great God and greatly to be praised. We would erase everything of the past that is not right and turn to this day and write upon it only the things that are just and good. Surrendering ourselves to Thee, may we keep it clean and pass the rest aside. The blessing of Thy grace impart; take us, mold us, and have us live in Thee. Bring tidings of joy, peace, and brotherhood to every section of our country. As its chosen servants, give us the spirit of courage and the virtue of sincerity to look life in the face with calm, undrooping gaze. O Lord God, lift us high above life's compromises and guide our souls by the unfading star of truth. Lead us, inspire us to serve, and even to suffer that our beloved homeland may be a grand temple of law, light, and love. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 5. Concurrent resolution to print and bind the proceedings in Congress, together with the proceedings at the unveiling in Statuary Hall, of the statue of Robert M. La Follette, presented by the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Printing.

THE REMAKING OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an address delivered by the President of the United States; another by the Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew W. Mellon; another by Senator REED SMOOT, chairman of the Public Buildings Commission; one by myself; and another by Milton B. Medary, of the American Institute of Architects; delivered last evening in the United States Chamber of Commerce Building at a meeting for the development of the city of Washington.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing several speeches delivered in the United States Chamber of Commerce Building last evening. Is there objection?

Mr. DENISON. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I was present and heard the speeches. I think they all ought to be printed as a public document. They were very valuable and informative.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman offer that as an amendment?

Mr. DENISON. No; I offer it as a suggestion. I am going to leave that to the gentleman from Indiana and the Printing Committee.

Mr. GREEN. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] has made a good suggestion. I think the country ought to have the benefit of these speeches that were made last night.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inquire of the gentleman whether the proceedings may not be incorporated in the Senate proceedings?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No. This was left to me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. Andrew W. Mellon; another by the President of the United States; another by Senator REED SMOOT, chairman of the Public Buildings Commission; one by myself; and another by Milton B. Medary, of the American Institute of Architects; delivered April 25, 1929, at the United States Chamber of Commerce Building, at a meeting for the development of the city of Washington:

SPEECH OF HON. A. W. MELLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

To-night history repeats itself. We are met under circumstances almost identical with those under which a meeting was held 25 years ago in the old Arlington Hotel, only a short distance from this place. Then, as now, it was a meeting of those representing the Government, and it was held for the purpose of considering plans to make more beautiful the city of Washington.

The principal speaker on that occasion was President Roosevelt. The Congress of the United States was represented by the speeches of Speaker Cannon and others; and Mr. Root, with his great eloquence, championed the cause which he had so much at heart and which he, himself had done so much to advance.

On that historic occasion the host was the American Institute of Architects. It is most fitting, therefore, that to-night we should have as our guests the representatives of that great and influential organization, to whose foresight and untiring efforts we owe not only the revival but the preservation and advancement of a plan for the orderly and systematic development of the Nation's Capital.

The meeting held in 1905 centered attention on the needs of Washington. At the same time it made certain that the future development of the city should conform to a balanced and comprehensive plan, based upon the spacious and dignified ideas of President Washington and Major l'Enfant, with such modifications as might be required to meet modern conditions and the city's growth.

Now we are engaged in trying to carry out those ideas. Conditions have reached a stage where economy demands that the Government's activity should be adequately housed in buildings owned by the Government itself; and, in order to meet this need, Congress has made the necessary appropriations to begin this work and to proceed with certain other plans for the orderly development of the city. The responsibility for the condemnation and purchase of sites and the erection of most of these buildings has been placed by Congress on the Treasury Department and has become, therefore, an integral part of Treasury activities.

The placing of these buildings involves a great responsibility for the proper determination of this question will largely influence the future development of Washington. Before coming to a decision the Treasury obtained the advice of Mr. Edward H. Bennett, of Chicago, a well-known architect, whose efforts have had so much to do with bringing to completion the plans for beautifying his native city. Mr. Bennett was appointed Consulting Architect of the Treasury; and, with a small group of other eminent architects from different parts of the country, has given unstintingly of his services in arriving at a solution of this problem.

These men have come to Washington at frequent intervals and have served without adequate remuneration in helping to work out a plan under which the new buildings shall be grouped and designed in such a way as to contribute in the greatest measure possible to the beauty of Washington. In evolving these plans the Treasury has had the cooperation of the Fine Arts Commission and its able and devoted chairman, Mr. Moore; with the Capital Park and Planning Commission; the Office of Public Buildings and Parks; and especially with those Members of the Senate and House of Representatives who are most directly concerned in this work and who have been so largely responsible for the developments now under way.

All of these developments have been embodied in a comprehensive plan, and it is this plan which will be presented to you to-night. We want also to have you view the model which has been made of public buildings to be erected along Pennsylvania Avenue. This model is on view to-night in a room adjoining the one in which we are now and will be taken later to the Treasury, where it will be left permanently on exhibition for all who care to view it.

It was to place these plans before you and also to make something in the nature of a visual presentation through motion pictures that have been prepared that we have asked this distinguished audience to come together to-night. I hope that the plans will meet with your approval so that we can proceed with carrying them out, fortified in the knowledge that we have your sanction and support. I am sure in advance of your deep interest, for it is a work which makes a strong appeal to everyone and gives us all an opportunity to do something of permanent value for the country.

No one has taken a deeper interest in this great undertaking than has President Hoover. In all the things that have been done and are now under way he has given his counsel and support, and behind the plans which have been made for the future he has placed the full force of his administration. It is a great privilege to have him here to-night and to have the honor of announcing the President of the United States, who will now address you.